



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The present reviewer—in common, he supposes, with most ordinary persons—has always thought that the narrative in Genesis, and the ancient tradition of the fall of the angels, furnished the poet with his subject; but he now learns that this is all wrong: “not the first book but the last of the sacred volume contains the framework of the poem.” It is, we now learn, an expansion of the seven trumpets of the Apocalypse, and we are carefully notified at what parts of the poem the respective soundings occur.

From this apocalyptic beginning one naturally expects strange things and marvellous unfoldings. Should we attempt any detailed examination of this commentator's mode of forcing strange interpretations upon seemingly simple statements, we should run the risk of tiring our reader's patience; so we will let one example suffice to show the method. The matter in hand is the erection of Pandemonium; the immediate theses are that Satan is Apollyon, therefore Apollo, and that Pandemonium is Papal Rome. He works thus:—Milton compares the fallen angels (I, 613) to blasted oaks and pines. “The oracle of Apollo at Cumae is established in the neighborhood of a dense forest of pines and oaks (*Aen.* vi, 180). It is plain, therefore, that Milton had Cumae and Apollo in his mind. Now follow carefully. We are presently told of a burning hill (670), of a plain (700) where, under the direction of Mammon, (who we are told is Jupiter, though Milton identifies him with Hephaistos or Mulciber), a palace is erected, which is Papal Rome. Here are the commentator's words:—“The scene widens from Cumae” [oak and pines] “first south to Vesuvius” [burning hill] “then north into the Campania” [plain] “until in the erection of the infernal Capitol it reaches Rome.” All roads lead to Rome, a proverb says, but surely this is one of the oddest.

Of the multitude of inept and irrelevant notes we shall cite but a single one. Milton (II, 880) says that the infernal gates, to let Satan pass, fly open

“With impetuous recoil and jarring sound.” On which the Professor has this luminous note:—

“*Recoil.* After long detention in the ‘iron furnace’ of Egypt, the children of Israel were thrust out, (*Exod.* xi, i). The recoil of Hell-gates is like the sudden urgency of the Egyptians after their sullen resistance.”

The present reviewer will cheerfully present his copy of the book to any one, Professor Hines included, who will explain the meaning or relevancy of this note.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—May I avail myself of your columns for addressing a request to all your readers interested especially in English philology? For some months past I have been engaged upon a bibliography of the study, getting titles and subjects entered upon catalogue-cards. The Cornell collection of books and periodicals is fairly good; certainly for recent years. But we are not blessed with everything. I should be extremely obliged, therefore, for information upon:—

a. Early literature, edd. etc., not recorded, for Oldest English, in Wülker's *Grundriss*.

b. Periodicals containing articles of value. Here I should like title in full, editor(s), publisher, date when the periodical was begun, etc. Thus, is the *Museum, Maanblad voor Philologie*, etc., edd. Blok, Speijer, Sijmons. Groningen; Wolters (begun 1893); to be had in this country? Or, *Tidskrift, nordisk, för Filologi?*

By “philology” I understand not merely linguistics, but authors, literature, *Kultur*, etc., coming down certainly to the Tudor period. Chaucer, however, I am unable to attack exhaustively.

While my pen is in, let me indite a few strictures upon the “sloppy” manner in which Petri has prepared the *Uebersicht*, etc. (1894) as Supplement-heft to the *Anglia* 1896-7. To begin, the editor might simplify and classify his references, to the great comfort of his readers, by using abbreviations. Why such ponderous entries as, p. 15, bottom, Sievers (E), Zur

Geschichte . . . Beiträge z. Gesch. d. d. Spr. u. Litt.? Would not the use of *P. B. Bei.* be equally clear and infinitely more concise? And why, in one entry, insert the number of the *Heft*, but omit it from another entry? Anyhow, why cite by *Heft* at all, instead of by page? Page 43, bottom, sub *Chettle*, Brandl's review of Ackermann is referred to *Litteraturbl.* v. 3, which is usually cited *Literaturbl. f. germ. u. rom. Philol.*; Zupitza's review is referred to *Archiv*, etc. ('94), meaning year 1894 (!), whereas usually the references are to volume (in this instance xcii, 99). Page 39, *Historia Brittonum*, Mommsen's article is referred to *Neues Archiv* 19, 2, but Zimmer's to xix, 3. Lastly, all the references to reviews in the *Anzeiger für d. Altertum* are referred to the *Zeitschrift*, though the two have different pagination and volume-numbering.

In brief, Petri and his successors ought to be exhorted to print at the beginning of each issue of the *Uebersicht* a strictly alphabetical list of abbreviations, and to use genuine abbreviations and not mere mutilations of title. To work with safety, this alphabetical list should, in fact, be prepared first of all.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

GERMAN ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—You will allow me a word of explanation in reference to Professor Blau's review of my *German Orthography and Phonology* in the June number of MOD. LANG. NOTES. He quotes from my book:—

"and if Berlin remains the capital of the Empire, it must ultimately have an importance and influence similar to that long exerted by the speech of London and Paris,"

and adds:—

"Of course, Mr. Hempl has a right to express some doubt as to whether Berlin is likely to remain the capital of the Empire, and it is not on that ground that I take exception to the above passage, although I cannot suppress a sad smile when I meet with such a suggestion in this place. 'Es thut mir weh, dass ich dich in der Gesellschaft seh.'"

I know that one cannot write on pronuncia-

tion and expect to escape contradiction, but I did not suppose that my innocent statement as to Berlin would be misunderstood and arouse feeling. As a philologist, I had no right to prophesy as to future German history. Personally I may say, however, that I hope and trust that Berlin will long remain the capital of Germany. In fact, I should also like to see that Germany include the whole German-speaking territory.

Detailed criticisms, such as Prof. Blau makes, are very welcome to me, though most of the points that he refers to will be found fully treated in the Word-List; it would have overburdened the text to there incorporate many details. The majority of Prof. Blau's criticisms pertain to the question of what is most usual. Being himself one of those who very kindly report to me their own usage and to whose faithful and unselfish collaboration the book owes so much, Prof. Blau should not have forgotten that my statements as to usage are not based upon the personal observation of any one individual, but upon that of representatives of all parts of Germany. For example, I personally agree with Prof. Blau in having long *u* and *ü* in *wusch*, *wuchs*, *wüchsig*, etc., and, like him, never use the short vowels. But I found that this older usage (it is a case of § 141 *b*, not, as Prof. Blau suggests, of § 137, N. 3) is now rare outside of parts of Middle Germany; and, as I was giving an account of general usage and not of that of my parents' native Saxony, I could not report otherwise than I did. For Prof. Blau's explanation of the secondary stress of *Elektricität*, etc., as due to the chief stress of *elektrisch*, etc., I am thankful; it is certainly the correct explanation.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

BRIEF MENTION.

Prof. T. A. Jenkins, of Vanderbilt University, has prepared and printed a series of forty-five lessons in Bevier's *French Grammar*, for the use of second-year students. Sample copies may be had by addressing (with stamp) Miss F. Jenkins, Gwynedd, Pa., and a limited number are available at a price to cover cost of printing.